

Date: Mon, 18 Jul 94 04:30:14 PDT
From: Ham-Policy Mailing List and Newsgroup <ham-policy@ucsd.edu>
Errors-To: Ham-Policy-Errors@UCSD.Edu
Reply-To: Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu
Precedence: Bulk
Subject: Ham-Policy Digest V94 #315
To: Ham-Policy

Ham-Policy Digest Mon, 18 Jul 94 Volume 94 : Issue 315

Today's Topics:

11 meters taking it back!!
3rd Party Traffic?????
Does CW as a pre-req
Emergency TX on police freq.
Home address or PO box on 610
Instead of CW
Re: CW ... My view.
Thoughts on CW testing

Send Replies or notes for publication to: <Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu>
Send subscription requests to: <Ham-Policy-REQUEST@UCSD.Edu>
Problems you can't solve otherwise to brian@ucsd.edu.

Archives of past issues of the Ham-Policy Digest are available
(by FTP only) from UCSD.Edu in directory "mailarchives/ham-policy".

We trust that readers are intelligent enough to realize that all text
herein consists of personal comments and does not represent the official
policies or positions of any party. Your mileage may vary. So there.

Date: 15 Jul 1994 17:15:18 GMT
From: olivea!spool.mu.edu!news.clark.edu!netnews.nwnet.net!news.u.washington.edu!
cummings@ames.arpa
Subject: 11 meters taking it back!!
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <304u2e\$gl7@fnnews.fnal.gov>, <rmike@FNAL0.FNAL.GOV> wrote:

> I've heard some nosies made about trying to take back 11 meters,
> if so I'm all for it because when 10 meters gets hot so will
> 11 and that gives us DX advantage.
> Now heres where I will probilty(sp) get in trouble,when and if we
> ever get back 11 meters why not dedicate that section to the
> (now lets not have any heart attacks or turning purple with rage.)
> No-Code Techs with a power limitation of let say 200 watts or
> even 100 watts.

> There I've proiblity(sp)stired up a hornets nest and I will
> get yelled at by the people who didn't have a heart attack,

I'm not going to yell, but I will say I think the fact that there are about 8 jillion CB rigs floating around out there makes this pretty impractical. I don't think there's any going back on this one. Even if the FCC made 11 meters an Amateur band by fiat, you're never going to have anything at 27 MHz except a QRM ghetto.

Besides, why take the band away from CBers? They've invested money in their rigs. We should have a better reason for taking their spectrum away than "we want it now."

--

Mike Cummings NX7E cummings@u.washington.edu
"Like jewels in a crown, the precious stones glittered in the Queen's round metal hat." - Jack Handey

Date: Sun, 17 Jul 1994 23:49:58 GMT
From: netcomsv!netcom.com!netcom7!faunt@decwrl.dec.com
Subject: 3rd Party Traffic?????
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

OK, is this pushing it? My wife, a Technician, and I, an Advanced (soon), are side by side in the front of the car with the TS50 between us. Can she make contacts outside her privileges, identifying the station with my callsign, and herself with her callsign? Obviously this is third party traffic, so those limitations apply. Something like her saying "this is station N6TQS, KD6HXY here" for ID sounds like it would be OK to me, but maybe confusing enough to be a problem. It'd be great for when I'm driving and she wants to talk.
Next question: who QSLs? Her or me?
73, doug

Date: 17 Jul 1994 17:25:03 GMT
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!usc!cs.utexas.edu!asuvax!chnews!cmoore@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: Does CW as a pre-req
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

Jeffrey Herman (jeffrey@kahuna.tmc.edu) wrote:

: But Cec, we don't see half of all transportation being conducted via
: horses. But that IS the case with CW, where about half of all QSO's
: on HF are conducted using code.

Hi again Jeff, seems like a chicken and egg thing to me. (Re: HF) If horses were allowed on all the roads and vehicles only on half the roads, there might still be a lot of horses on the roads. How about opening all ham frequencies to all modes and may the best mode win?

: Now, what do you think of my proposal to require a tech license for
: 11M? Expand it into the land mobile band (if possible), eliminate
: the channel-scheme in favor of VFO, keep the current power restriction,
: allow all HF modes. This would clean up 11M and also give the techs
: an HF band. I'll let the rest of you decide what to do with all the
: current users.... Of course this could never be implimented, could it?
: Jeff NH6IL

I once had an Amateur Radio Service license that covered 11m. For your plan to work the licensed 11m operators would need an advantage over the unlicensed operators... more power maybe?... SSB?... SS? One thing for sure, 11m was better when it was a ham band and needs cleaning up now.

73, Cecil, KG7BK

Date: 16 Jul 1994 22:01:55 -0400
From: news1.digex.net!digex.net!not-for-mail@uunet.uu.net
Subject: Emergency TX on police freq.
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <306sjg\$j1d@vortex.eng.sc.rolm.com> montp@vortex.eng.sc.rolm.com writes:

> >I believe that I read a of a case in So. California where this happened,
> >if memory serve, the guy tried repeaters & cell phones and finally made
> >the call on public safety freq's. He had his radio (license as well?)
> >taken away, the justification was that it was not FCC type accepted for
> >those frequencies.
>
> If this is the same story I heard, the ham was exonerated. Naturally
> the police confiscated his radio, but mainly that was due to their
> ignorance of emergency justified transmissions. If I remember right
> after a few weeks and a call to the local mayor by an ARRL
> representative, his radio was returned intact.

This was also a case of ignorance on the part of the ham, who should have realized that the police can't just take your property without due process of law (pesky thing, that 4th amendment). My response to a 'request' from the police to appear at HQ with my radio would have been to appear sans radio but with my lawyer (who missed his last rabies shot and just *loves* cops who

step on their crank).

Education can only go so far: sometimes you have to use a 20# sledge.

Frank Ney EMT-A N4ZHG LPVa NRA ILA GOA CCRTBLA 'M-O-U-S-E'

--

"Apparently on New Texas, killing a politician was not _malum in se_, and was _malum prohibitorum_ only to the extent that what the politician got was in excess of what he deserved."

-H. Beam Piper, _Lone Star Planet/A Planet For Texans_

Date: 15 Jul 1994 15:02:57 GMT

From: lll-winken.llnl.gov!overload.lbl.gov!agate!howland.reston.ans.net!math.ohio-state.edu!news.acns.nwu.edu!kgkmac.repoc.nwu.edu!user@ames.arpa

Subject: Home address or PO box on 610

To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

Hi

I'm fairly new to this newsgroup, having only taken my no tech test in late June and am in the never ending waiting mode for my license to arrive. My question is, do a majority of hams use PO Box's or their real address. I could see the concern about using real address, with the call sign database readily available and the amount of money some hams have invested in equipment.

Is a PO Box the way to go, or is this not really a problem. Being new, I want to start off on the right track and set up correctly the first time by using advice from experienced people. Since I only have a couple of HT's currently, this is not an issue, but may expand in the future after taking the code test and perhaps even get some QSL cards printed up.

Thanks

Ken

--

Kenneth Kalan PP ASEL
Northwestern University
Prosthetics Research Laboratory
Rehabilitation Engineering Program
kgk@nwu.edu

====_ / _ |
| ___/[___] ___/___ |
|__ _|___|_____/___=
| \ /
o 0

Date: Sun, 17 Jul 1994 13:48:15 GMT
From: psinnntp!arrl.org!zlau@uunet.uu.net
Subject: Instead of CW
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

How about additional privileges for using gear you designed and built? Wouldn't using your homebrew transceiver be a good indicator of technical competence that flammers are looking for?

At least in the 90s, it looks like EMI/RFI/TVI solving skills are still quite relevant for amateurs. Thus, how about hands on test to see how people can fix these problems?

--
Zack Lau KH6CP/1 2 way QRP WAS
 8 States on 10 GHz
Internet: zlau@arrl.org 10 grids on 2304 MHz

Date: 15 Jul 1994 17:03:57 GMT
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!usc!howland.reston.ans.net!europa.eng.gtefsd.com!news.msfc.nasa.gov!usenet@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: Re: CW ... My view.
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

>And even more of a shame that the CW ops rely on old technology to get
>messages thru without backing them up with modern DPS technology that
>could continue a contact with after the CW signal drifts into the noise.
>If all the morse ops will equip themselves with DPS technologies to
>continue their contacts after the contact starts to fade, you might have a
>point. As it is you are just trying to force others into 'your' favorite
>mode. And that is, by no means, the most popular mode in use.

What makes you believe that CW ops do not use modern technology to get their signals through better? Call it a hunch, but I bet a DSP filter works better with a discrete mode like CW than it does with an analog mode like voice (SSB) ;)

Unfortunately, I still have the same problem with CW that I do on voice when using a DSP filter. I can hear stations that cannot hear me. I guess I am just going to have to run that 220V line and build that amp :-)

Paul (Cliffy) Palmer, -.-- .. -.. --.
New Technology, Inc.
700 Boulevard South, Suite 401
Huntsville, Alabama 35802

Internet: palmer@Trade-Zone.msfc.nasa.gov.
Telephone: (205) 461-4569

Date: Sat, 16 Jul 1994 04:39:58 GMT
From: pacbell.com!att-out!walter!dancer.cc.bellcore.com!not-for-mail@ames.arpa
Subject: Thoughts on CW testing
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <306t78\$i9j@agate.berkeley.edu>,
Ken A. Nishimura <kennish@kabuki.EECS.Berkeley.EDU> wrote:
>

>Interesting. But your argument is based on the fallicy that the technical
>side of the current exams really do demonstrate technical excellence
>and knowledge, and by studying for them, you promote technical education.
>We all know that this is false.

Frankly, I'm fed up with this type of empty argument...that the testing
today doesn't foster technical excellence or interest in furthering
ones knowledge. Becoming a ham as a teenager and passing the
general class license theory test in 1958 certainly dovetailed
with my becoming an electronics major in college and continueing
in electronics as a career.

>First, by having question pools, it is possible for a technically
>incompetent but a good memorizer to pass the Extra written with
>flying colors.

There have always been "question pools"of a sort. I study in 1958
using an AMECO license guide of questions from prior tests. So what?
Will some people with excellent memory ability simply pass the test,
sure, but I've met many who got through college that way to.

Please suggest how YOU would improve the testing over what is done
today. Before you do though, keep in mind that"fill in the blanks"
questions and/or essay questions leave much room for interpretation
in many cases. Remember to that this is a hobby, not an absolute
commitment to a career or to becoming an "expert" in radio
theory.

I've said before, I'd encourage those questions that involve use
of equations to not repeat the same variables so that a test

taker must actually apply the use of the correct formula and calculate the answer. But other questions just don't lend themselves very easily to anything but multiple choice type questions.

>Second, the material covered in the exam is mostly outmoded and
>insufficient to demonstrate an individual's ability to
>advance the state of radio art as it exists in the 1990s. Most extras
>today couldn't pass a 1960s style written, when you had to go into
>the FCC office and DRAW CIRCUITS. Can you draw a Colpitts oscillator?
>A Hartley? A Pierce?

Guess how I passed that test in 1958. I memorized the circuit diagrams. Guess how often I've had to rely on knowing those diagrams over the last 30+ years? If design interests are your thing then fine, if not, who cares.

>Explain the differences, and why one would
>use one over another? Can you draw an impedance matching network
>to transform the output of an RF transistor to a resonant antenna?
>Use a Smith Chart? How about a practical exam, say doing the RF
>plumbing for a repeater complete with directional couplers,
>isolators, and cavities?

Guess you only want electrical enginners to become amateurs. Sorry, I couldn't disagree more. This is a hobby, not a carrer, BUT this hobby is often the front end to a career path and that is what this is all about, at least from my perspective.

>I am not saying that these are required to be a good amateur operator,
>but if you want to implement parallel tracks for "advancement"
>in the amateur licensing scheme, then make it worth something.
>A person with these (or similar) skills would be a great asset
>to the amateur community.

Seems to me we have many great assetts now and we'd have even more in the future if we reduced the CW emphasis (pass/fail) of the current testing requirements (NOTE - I didn't say eliminate all CW testing...I've said reduce the emphasis. How do you reduce the emphasis? You either lower the code speed requirements while retaining the separate element requiremnt OR you integrate the 10 CW questions into the total test score and score the combined on a 75% correct basis.

>What stymies me to this day is why the entire 50 MHz and up spectrum
>is given to anyone passing the Tech exam. If there is any spectrum
>where the correlation between technical ability and ability to use
>the bands exists, it would be in the upper frequencies. If you

>want to promote the technical ladder, the "carrot" should be
>slices of VHF and up segments, unless the FCC wants all of us
>to be "appliance operators."

>My 2 cents. Oh, the above is not intended to cast any
>opinion on the CW portion of this proposal. I'm staying out
>of that one, as usual :-)

Could have fooled me :-)

Standard Disclaimer- Any opinions, etc. are mine and NOT my employer's.

Bill Sohl (K2UNK) BELLCORE (Bell Communications Research, Inc.)
Morristown, NJ email via UUCP bcr!cc!whs70
201-829-2879 Weekdays email via Internet whs70@cc.bellcore.com

Date: 15 Jul 1994 23:09:01 GMT
From: agate!spool.mu.edu!news.clark.edu!netnews.nwnet.net!news.u.washington.edu!
cummings@ames.arpa
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <304u2e\$gl7@fnnews.fnal.gov>, <306g76\$20i@news.u.washington.edu>,
<1994Jul15.205054.1463@mixcom.mixcom.com>n.edu
Subject : Re: 11 meters taking it back!!

In article <1994Jul15.205054.1463@mixcom.mixcom.com>,
kevin jessup <kevin.jessup@mixcom.mixcom.com> wrote:
>In <306g76\$20i@news.u.washington.edu> cummings@u.washington.edu (Mike Cummings)
writes:

>
>>In article <304u2e\$gl7@fnnews.fnal.gov>, <rmike@FNAL0.FNAL.GOV> wrote:

>>> I've heard some nosies made about trying to take back 11 meters,
>>> if so I'm all for it because when 10 meters gets hot so will
>>> 11 and that gives us DX advantage.

>
>>I'm not going to yell, but I will say I think the fact that there are about
>>8 jillion CB rigs floating around out there makes this pretty impractical.
>>I don't think there's any going back on this one. Even if the FCC made 11
>>meters an Amateur band by fiat, you're never going to have anything at 27
>>MHz except a QRM ghetto.

>
>By a similar logic, I guess we never have to worry about
>the FCC taking away the 2-meter ghetto either!

I don't know where you get that.

If the FCC wanted to get the CB band back, it'd have to make the selling of CBs illegal, and then wait 20 years. Also, it would be relatively easy for the FCC to shut repeaters down and make FM pretty unusable. The same is not true for CB.

I don't agree that 2m is just like CB, like so many people say. There's a lot of traffic there, but it's not like CB, in spite of the bad spots. In our area 2m is generally polite and orderly.

--

Mike Cummings NX7E cummings@u.washington.edu
"Like jewels in a crown, the precious stones glittered in the Queen's round metal hat." - Jack Handey

Date: Fri, 15 Jul 1994 16:57:42 GMT
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!usc!math.ohio-state.edu!news.acns.nwu.edu!news.eecs.nwu.edu!
ahab.eecs.nwu.edu!hpa@network.ucsd.edu
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <1994Jul13.210513.6384@ke4zv.atl.ga.us>, <Csx2JB.9EL@news.Hawaii.Edu>,
<071594043738Rnf0.78@amcomp.com>
Reply-To : hpa@nwu.edu (H. Peter Anvin)
Subject : Re: Re: Does CW as a pre-req REALLY Work?

This is *my* personal opinion on the CW requirement, and since this debate relates to U.S. rules I have set the distribution to "usa".

We, as hams, do have responsibilities as well as a privilege. Two of those responsibilities are to provide a trained pool of radio operators and technicians for emergency communications and to advance the state of the radio art.

Currently the licensing rules are heavily tilted toward the first. I consider CW to be an essential skill for emergency communications, but it for sure is not advancing the state of the radio art. In my opinion, the higher CW requirements should be reduced, **not lifted**, and the technical tests should be made significantly harder. I consider it to be strange that I as a high school junior in 1989 could pass the Advanced without ever having looked at the study material (I didn't even own any study material for that test) and fail the Extra by only one question margin (since the Extra has quite a bit of regulations on it I had no clue about, like space operation). On the other hand, why would you need to copy Morse code at 20 WPM in order to be the licensee of a ham satellite (a privilege for Extras only)? I certainly admire the people who can, but I am simply not interested in CW operation enough to warrant that time expenditure; I'd much

rather spend it doing technical experimentation or learning more about how to design a spread-spectrum correlator or how to create high-performance error-correcting systems for data transmission over unreliable HF skywave paths.

There is also an option that I think noone has considered: how about a two-track licensing system? One track would be the existing system (20 WPM Morse code + basic Smith chart theory = Extra) and another one which would require basic Morse code proficiency (say, 10 WPM) plus a *significant* engineering knowledge in order to pass the theory; it should not be feasible to pass without knowing how to design a working transceiver, radio modem or any similar device.

/hpa

--

INTERNET: hpa@nwu.edu FINGER/TALK: hpa@ahab.eecs.nwu.edu
IBM MAIL: I0050052 at IBMMAIL HAM RADIO: N9ITP or SM4TKN
FIDONET: 1:115/511 or 1:115/512 STORMNET: 181:294/101 Allah-u-abha
"NT is not a bad thing if I don't have to use it..." -- xmsb@borland.com

Date: Fri, 15 Jul 1994 04:55:00 EST
From: agate!usenet.ins.cwru.edu!wariat.org!amcomp!dan@ames.arpa
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <d3.553.126@alley.com>, <303efi\$81o@news.iastate.edu>,
<304reb\$evv@tequesta.gate.net>
Subject : Re: Existing regulations

optronic@gate.net (Bob Bronson) writes:

>JUST ME (twp77@isuvax.iastate.edu) wrote:

>: In article <d3.553.126@alley.com>, john.hiatt@alley.com (John Hiatt) writes:

>: >I find a problem with this. Isn't ordering a pizza facilitating the

>: >affairs of a business? I thought that was illegal use of a phone patch.

>: >What am I missing here?

>

>: You're missing the changes to part 97. It is now legal to order a pizza by

>: autopatch, as long as you don't do it regularly, or as long as you don't profit

>: by the phone call.

>

>Looking at part 97.113, (1/93) I don't see any pizza changes. Someone

>seeing a newer part 97 or a different interpretation?

In the announcement made by the FCC and the person at the FCC who headed the revision of the rules (can't remember his name see W5YI report of the

time) used the 'pizza' example himself. If anyone is interested I will find and post the 4 part test that he suggested we use in determining if a transmission is appropriate.

Dan

--

"Is life so dear, or peace so sweet, as to be purchased at the price of chains and slavery? Forbid it, Almighty God! I know not what course others may take, but as for me, GIVE ME LIBERTY, OR GIVE ME DEATH!" -Patrick Henry, Virginia House of Burgesses on March 23,1775
=+=+=> Ted Kennedy's car has killed more people than my gun! - Me

Date: Fri, 15 Jul 1994 04:51:00 EST
From: agate!usenet.ins.cwru.edu!wariat.org!amcomp!dan@ames.arpa
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <CsuFws.L8u@news.Hawaii.Edu>, <071494061943Rnf0.78@amcomp.com>, <CsyDIn.238@news.Hawaii.Edu>,
Subject : Re: Does CW as a pre-req

jeffrey@kahuna.tmc.edu (Jeffrey Herman) writes:

>(Me)

>>(Yes a whole 38% of amateurs surveyed (by the ARRL) use CW regularly.

>

>I'd say that survey is a bit conservative - listen to the HF bands

>and COUNT the actual CW vs any-other-mode QSO's.

Not conservative, maybe not scientific either, just a survey.

>Earlier I wrote:

>

>>>Now, what do you think of my proposal to require a tech license for

>>>11M? Expand it into the land mobile band (if possible), eliminate

>...

>>>current users.... Of course this could never be implimented, could it?

>

>

>>Of course not Jeff, as you point out the ITU requires morse send and

>>recieve testing for operation below 30 MHZ (ARS only), since 11 is about

>>27(?) then it too would require both send and recieve testing.

>

>But you've argued that Japan found a way around the ITU requirement:

>low power and domestic communications only.

>

>Gee Dan, after 2 years in this debate I am finally compromising!

>You've got 24 hours to accept my proposal or I'll withdraw it ;)

Well, if you are willing to have us notify the ITU we are opting out of the treaty requirement for SEND AND RECIEVE testing...

I would agree with anything that would give 11 meters back to the hams. And I have proposed this myself (I doubt it was on usenet though).

Dan

--

"Is life so dear, or peace so sweet, as to be purchased at the price of chains and slavery? Forbid it, Almighty God! I know not what course others may take, but as for me, GIVE ME LIBERTY, OR GIVE ME DEATH!" -Patrick Henry, Virginia House of Burgesses on March 23,1775
=+=+=> Ted Kennedy's car has killed more people than my gun! - Me

Date: 15 Jul 1994 12:58:07 GMT
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!dog.ee.lbl.gov!agate!howland.reston.ans.net!math.ohio-state.edu!magnus.acs.ohio-state.edu!wvhorn@network.ucsd.edu
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <Csx2JB.9EL@news.Hawaii.Edu>, <303o5f\$80d@abyss.West.Sun.COM>, <CsyEz4.2MK@news.Hawaii.Edu>

Subject : Re: Re: Does CW as a pre-req REALLY Work?

In article <CsyEz4.2MK@news.Hawaii.Edu>, Jeffrey Herman <jeffrey@kahuna.tmc.edu> wrote:

>1. Example: Tuning across 40M, CW QSOs run from 45% to 55% of all other
>modes I hear, depending upon the time of the evening and the night of
>the week (correlation? not sure yet.)
>Just perform a count yourself!
>Source: 40M and my receiver.

Example: Watching the traffic at my local airport, I see that 85% - 95% of the traffic is multi-engined. Logically, therefore, all pilots should be required to be multi-engine rated before being allowed to fly.

Source: Looking up.

Works for us.

---Bill VanHorne

End of Ham-Policy Digest V94 #315
